

U.S. Appln. No. 09/692,927  
Reply to Office Action dated June 13, 2005

PATENT  
450117-02828

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

#### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 11-30 are pending in this application. Claims 11, 15, 21, and 25, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicant is entitled.

#### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 11-14 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections.

U.S. Appln. No. 09/692,927  
Reply to Office Action dated June 13, 2005

PATENT  
450117-02828

The amendments herewith to claims 11, 15, 21, and 25 obviate the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections.

### III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

Claims 11-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly anticipated by admitted prior art in the Specification of the instant application.

Claim 11, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

“...a number of decoding units; and

a number of normalization units each located at an output side of a respective decoding unit...

...wherein the number of normalization units is smaller than the number of decoding units.” (emphasis added)

Applicant notes that the Office Action indicates that reference sign 31 in Figure 3 designates a decoding unit. However, as can be seen in the Specification, the decoding units are designated with reference signs 25 and 30. All of the decoding units according to this prior art design are provided with normalization units 27 and 33 at its output side. The reference sign 31 does not designate a decoding unit, but an interleaver.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above, independent claims 15, 21, and 25 are also believed to be patentable.

### IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are dependent from one of the amended independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the

U.S. Appln. No. 09/692,927  
Reply to Office Action dated June 13, 2005

PATENT  
450117-02828


invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant

By   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800